

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended at pages 1-4, claims 4-9 have been cancelled, claims 14 and 15 have been amended, and claims 18 and 19 are new (support can be found in, e.g., Fig. 3, 5c, 6b, and 7). No new matter has been presented herein.

Pages 1, 3, 4, 7, and 8 of the specification has been objected to for containing references to claim numbers. These pages of the specification have been amended by the deletion of the clauses “relating to claim 1,” “relating to claim 2,” and “relating to claim 3.” Therefore, it is requested that this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-9 have been rejected under (1) 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,399,169), Shukuri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,387,460), and Demars (U.S. Patent No. 5,643,644); (2) 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by any of Domi et al. (U.S. App. No. 2003/0108692), Futagami et al. (U.S. App. No. 2003/0108693), or Futagami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,663,923); and (3) 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danner (U.S. Patent No. 2,193,393) in view of Demars. Claims 4-9 have been cancelled, thus rendering these rejections of claims 4-9 moot.

Claims 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Wang et al., Domi et al., Futagami et al. (U.S. App. No. 2003/0108693), Futagami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,663,923), or Demars. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. It is believed that these claims are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), for the following reasons.


Domi et al., Futagami et al. (U.S. App. No. 2003/0108693), and Futagami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,663,923) each have an international filing date of November 27, 2001. The instant application claims a priority date of July 5, 2001, and the specification has been amended to recite this priority data. Therefore, these references do not qualify as prior art references for the instant application and they should be removed from the rejection.

Additionally, neither Wang et al. nor Demars teach or suggest concave edges on the outer faces of the low temperature melting glass, as required by amended independent claims 14 and 15, and new independent claim 18. This recitation of the concavity of the outer faces of the low temperature melting glass was added to independent claims 14 and 15 (which is also an element of new independent claim 18) to make explicit what is an inherent property of the claimed product. Accordingly, this difference distinguishes Wang et al. and Demars from the instant claims and it is requested that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 14-15 be withdrawn. Since claim 16 depends from claim 14 and claim 17 depends from claim 15, it is requested that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 16 and 17 be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claims 14 and 15. Moreover, it is submitted that new independent claim 18 and new dependent claim 19 are not amenable to a rejection based on Wang et al. and Demars, for the same reasons discussed *supra*.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

By 
Norman Hanson
Reg. No. 30,946

666 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10103
(212) 318-3148
Enclosure